

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/878,465	HULT, VERN A.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Shane Bomar	3672	

All Participants:

(1) Shane Bomar.

(2) Scott Servilla.

Status of Application: Amended

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 9 June 2004

Time: 12:45pm

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

None

Claims discussed:

119

Prior art documents discussed:

None

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The applicants response to the Office Action mailed 9/17/03 included an amendment to claim 1 (the only rejected claim) that distinguished the claim over the applied prior art. However, new claims 66-148 were also added in this response. It was noted that the independent claims in this new set included previously indicated allowable subject matter, except for claim 119. This claim was broader than any claim present in the current set, and the examiner determined that this claim could still be rejected in view of previously disclosed prior art. The examiner contacted the applicant to inform him that this one claim would be rejected and a Final Office Action would need to be sent. The applicant informed the examiner that claim 119 could be cancelled via examiner's amendment to place the case in condition for allowance and thus negated the need for a Final Office Action..